PTOL-413A (06-09)
Approved for use through 07/31/2009. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

# Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/565,747 First Named Applicant: _____

Examiner: BUCKLE JR JAMES J Art Unit: 3633 Status of Application: Pending

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) Jeremy A. Schweigert (2) BUCKLE JR JAMES J

(3) _____ (4) _____

**Proposed Date of Interview:** September 1, 2010 **Proposed Time:** 2:00 AM/PM

**Type of Interview Requested:**

(1) ☑ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

**Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ YES ☑ NO

**If yes, provide brief description:** _____

## Issues To Be Discussed

| Issues (Rej., Obj., etc) | Claims/ Fig. #s | Prior Art | Discussed | Agreed | Not Agreed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) 112 | Claim 1 | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (2) 103 | Claim 1 | AAPA / Ramm | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (3) | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (4) | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

☑ Continuation Sheet Attached

**Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:**

See attached.

**An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on** _____ .

**NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).**

**This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.**

Jeremy Schweigert

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Jeremy A. Schweigert

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

56,244

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

US App no.: 10/565,747
Examiner: BUCKLE JR JAMES J

112 rejection – the spec is silent regarding drawings being to scale or not being to scale. The drawings do appear to be to scale – especially the portions that support the claims.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view U.S. Patent No. 5,426,903 to Ramm et al., (hereinafter, "Ramm"). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of cited references.

Claim 1 recites in part "wherein the second tower segment within its embedded end portion comprises a plurality of separate anchoring elements projecting radially from at least one of the side surfaces of the wall of the second tower segment, the plurality of anchoring elements being fixedly mounted to at least one side surface of the wall" and "wherein the plurality of anchoring elements comprises a first type of anchoring elements having an enlarged free end portion with a diameter or length greater than or substantially equal to a distance from the free end portion to the wall of the second tower segment and a second type of anchoring elements having at least sections of annular portions that are only in contact with one of the sides of the wall of the second tower segment" Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA fails to disclose at least these features of the claim.

The AAPA describes a **single** flat ring-like element 6, not a plurality of separate anchoring elements nor different types of anchoring elements. Also, the AAPA expressly illustrates the single flat ring-like element 6 as being in contact with the bottom of the steel segment 3. AAPA, page 2, lines 23-29, Figure 5.

In contrast to amended claim 1, the AAPA fails to teach or describe **"a plurality of separate anchoring elements"** as recited in claim 1, because the AAPA describes a **single** flat ring-like anchoring element 6 that is disposed at one location at the bottom of the steel segment 3. The AAPA fails to teach or describe a **plurality of anchoring elements** being fixedly mounted to at least one side surface of the wall of the second tower segment because the single flat ring-like anchoring element is arranged at one location at the **bottom** of the steel segment 3. The AAPA fails to teach or describe two

different types of anchoring elements. The AAPA fails to teach or describe a first type of anchoring elements having an enlarged free end portion. The AAPA fails to teach or describe a second type of anchoring elements having at least sections of annular portions that are **only** in contact with either one of the side surfaces of the wall of the second tower segment because the AAPA illustrates that the single flat ring-like anchoring element contacts the **bottom** of the wall of the tower segment.

For at least the reasons given above, AAPA fails to teach all the features of claim 1.

Ramm describes a welded-on dowel for a steel/concrete composite construction. Ramm discloses and illustrates in Figures 1 and 8 a head that has a diameter that is significantly less than a distance from the head to the steel component. (Ramm, col. 3, lines 46-67).

In contrast to amended claim 1, Ramm fails to teach or describe "a plurality of separate anchoring elements projecting radially from at least one of the side surfaces of the wall of the second tower segment" as recited in claim 1, because Ramm is silent regarding a dowel being projected **radially** from any surface of a steel component. Ramm fails to teach or describe two different types of anchoring elements because Ramm merely discloses a dowel. Ramm fails to teach or describe a first type of anchoring elements having an enlarged free end portion **with a diameter or length greater than or substantially equal to a distance from the free end portion to the wall** of the second tower segment because Ramm illustrates that a head of the dowel has a diameter that is significantly less than a distance from the head to the steel component. Ramm fails to teach or describe a second type of anchoring elements having at least sections of annular portions that are only in contact with either one of the side surfaces of the wall of the second tower segment.

For at least the reasons given above, Ramm fails to teach all the features of claim 1.